

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 20 2007

Remarks

Claims 1-19 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1, 7, 12 and 16 are amended, and claims 2-6, 8-11, 13-15 and 17-19 are original. It is noted that the Examiner referred to claims 1-16, but there are 19 claims pending in the present application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to acknowledge the 19 pending claims.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, and 4-16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Allen, Jr. et al. (US 2001/0017861 A1).

The following legal requirement is quoted from MPEP 2131 and establishes what is required to sustain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Regarding independent claims 1, 7, 12, and 16, the Examiner alleged that "Allen discloses an ATM based distributed virtual tandem switching system, which comprises: Forming a cluster of media gateways. each of the media gateways having a respective "transcoder (Referring to Figure 4, T-IWF 28 and CS-IWF 30 (cluster of media gateways) which provide protocol and signaling conversion (transcoder). See paragraphs 0045 and 0046;) Providing at least one first media gateway of the cluster of media gateways having an integrated broadband SS7 signaling gateway, at least one second media gateway of the cluster of media gateways being without an integrated broadband SS7 signaling gateway (Referring to Figure 4, the centralized

control and signaling interworking function, CS-IYYT 30, performs call control functions and conversion between narrowband signaling, Signaling System 7 (SS7), protocol, and a broadband signaling protocol for call processing and control within the ATM network, the T-FWF 28 does not provide such signaling. See paragraphs 0045 and 0046;) and using the at least one first media gateway for SS7 signaling and using at least one second gateway of the cluster of media gateways being without an integrated broadband SS7 signaling gateway for resources other than SS7 signaling (Referring to Figure4, CS-IWF 30, performs SS7 signaling and the CS-IWF 30 provides protocol conversion to and from TDM/ATM. See paragraphs 0045 and 0046.)”

Allen, Jr. et al. discloses an Asynchronous Transfer Mode (ATM)-based distributed virtual tandem switching system in which a network of ATM-based devices is combined to create a distributed virtual tandem switch. The system includes an ATM switching network that dynamically sets up individual switched virtual connections. The system also includes a trunk interworking function (T-IWF) device and a centralized control and signaling interworking function (CS-IWF) device. The trunk interworking function device converts end office voice trunks from TDM channels to ATM cells by employing a structured circuit emulation service. The centralized control and signaling interworking function device performs call control functions and interfaces narrowband signaling and broadband signaling for call processing and control within the ATM switching network. Consequently, the ATM based distributed virtual tandem switching system replaces a standard tandem switch in the PSTN.

The independent claims have been amended to more clearly describe the present invention. For example, in claim 1 the following feature has been added: using a single media gateway with an integrated broadband SS7 signaling gateway as a single SS7 point code for more than one gateway of the cluster of media gateways. The other independent claims have been similarly amended. The Examiner admitted that Allen does not disclose using a single broadband SS7 signaling gateway for multiple wireless access gateways.

On page 5 of the specification it is set forth that "Thus, embodiments of the present system and method allow a single media gateway with an integrated broadband SS7 signaling gateway to be used as a single SS7 point code for more than one gateway of the cluster of media gateways." Thus, the amendment to the claims is supported by the specification as originally filed.

The Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen (US 2001/0017861 A1) in view of Benedyk et al. (US 6,952,433 B1).

MPEP §706.02(j) states:

"To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991)."

MPEP §2143.01 states:

"Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. The test for an implicit showing is what the combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved, as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. In re Kotzab, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000). See also In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992)."

Thus, to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, it must be demonstrate that all of the following elements: 1) suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, to combine the reference teachings; 2) reasonable expectation of success found in the prior art; and 3) the prior art references (combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.

Regarding claim 3 as explained in the rejection statement of claim 1, Allen discloses all of the claim limitations of claim 1 (parent claim). However, the Examiner admitted that Allen does not disclose using a single broadband SS7 signaling gateway for multiple wireless access gateways. The Examiner further stated that Allen discloses a centralized control and signaling interworking function device, which acts a single broadband SS7 signaling gateway (Referring to Figure 4, see paragraphs 0045 and 0046.). The Examiner then alleged that Benedyk teaches a method and system for routing messages in a radio access network, in which a Radio Access

Network Gateway provides the signaling for multiple Radio Access Network Controllers (multiple wireless access gateways) (Referring to Figure 3, see paragraph 0023.) The Examiner then concluded that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the Radio Access Network Controllers of Benedyk in the system of Allen, and that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to do so in order to improve system access by extending service to wireless handsets for conventional SS7 and ATM-based network elements as taught by Benedyk (See paragraph 0023.)

Benedyk discloses a system and method that enables a more flexible architecture in communication networks with separated call control and bearer control. The invention enables full support of the advantages of a communication network with separated call control and bearer control when interfacing with a further network with monolithic signalling. The invention also increases the flexibility of an existing payload connection, especially in the case of a malfunction. The invention uses the existing signalling protocols to transfer further information. Basically, information elements and methods to interpret the transferred information are stored in the receivers and senders of the information. This enables the receivers and senders of information to transmit more information than originally planned when the protocols were designed. So it is possible to identify a combination of a payload transmission device and a control node instead of a single device only. It is further possible, to identify an assignment as a further assignment. This allows the change of a current assignment for a radio access controller.

Regarding the description of Figure 3 in Benedyk, the following is set forth:

"FIG. 3 shows an extract of an UMTS communication network including a media gateway MGW1, a mobile services switching centre MSC and a radio network controller RNC. The radio network controller RNC is in this case a terminating radio network controller RNC. As the network and the signaling in the network on both sides of the shown extract are not important for the invention they are not explained. A payload connection is already through connected to an incoming logical point Pi1 of the media gateway MGW1. The mobile services switching centre MSC is in charge of the call control after it received for example an initial address message. In a first step 1 the mobile services switching centre MSC orders the radio network controller RNC to page the subscriber. It receives a page response and does the call set-up and call confirmation. In a second step 2 resources in the media gateway MGW1 are ordered, granted and through connected via an intermediate logical point Pv1 to an outgoing logical point Po1. In a next step 3 the mobile services switching centre MSC orders the radio network controller RNC to assign the call. The radio network controller RNC requests and gets a connection establishment from the media gateway MGW1. Now the payload connection is set up from the incoming logical point Pi1 to the radio network controller RNC. In a next step 6 the radio network controller RNC sends an assignment response to the mobile services switching centre MSC.

The mobile services switching centre MSC starts a rerouting of the call. In this example because it receives an error message in a next step 7. This error message informs the mobile services switching centre MSC that the selected logical point Po1 has got a malfunction. The mobile services switching centre MSC requires and gets in a next step 8 from the media gateway a connection in the intermediate logical point Pv1 to a new resource. In next step 9 this resource Po12 is required, granted and through connected. The new payload connection is now through

connected the outgoing logical point Po12. In a further step 10 the mobile services switching centre MSC sends a second assignment request to the radio network controller RNC. The radio network controller RNC recognizes that there is already an assignment for this call. This is recognized either by a call identification that is sent with the assignment message or, as in GSM networks, by the SCCP (Signaling Connection Control Part) connection this assignment is sent through. If the second assignment requires different bearer capabilities than the first assignment, this is recognized because the second assignment has a different assignment type. Different bearer capabilities force the radio network controller RNC to release the existing connection to a user equipment and set up a new connection. The radio network controller RNC sends a second establish request and receives a second establish confirm in a next step 11. The radio network controller RNC replaces the current payload connection to the logical point Po1 of the media gateway MGW1 by the new payload connection to the logical point Po12 of the media gateway MGW2. In a next step 12 the radio network controller RNC sends a second assignment response to the mobile services switching centre MSC."

This does not appear to support the Examiner's statement that Benedyk teaches a method and system for routing messages in a radio access network, in which a Radio Access Network Gateway provides the signaling for multiple Radio Access Network Controllers (multiple wireless access gateways). Therefore the rejection of claim 3 is traversed.

The Examiner has not established a prima facie case of obviousness, in that the Examiner has not demonstrated that all of the following elements are present: 1) suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, to

combine the reference teachings; 2) reasonable expectation of success found in the prior art; and 3) the prior art references (combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.


The dependent claims include all the limitations of the respective independent claims upon which they depend and therefore are also allowable over the cited prior art.

Applicants have discussed herein one or more differences between the cited prior art, and the claimed invention with reference to one or more parts of the cited prior art. This discussion, however, is in no way meant to acquiesce in any characterization that one or more parts of the cited prior art correspond to the claimed invention.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is therefore respectfully requested. In view of the above remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered to be of general interest only. This application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action at an early date is earnestly solicited. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



John R. Garrett
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 27,888

Dated: August 20, 2007

CARMEN B. PATTI & ASSOCIATES, LLC
Customer Number 47382